IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMKUMAR

THURSDAY, THE 28TH JUNE 2007 / 7TH ASHADHA 1929

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 2508 of 2007()

REVN. PETITIONER: PETITIONER/APPELLANT/ACCUSED

DAVOOD, S/O. ABDURAHMANKUTTY HAJI,
DAVOOD & CO. TRADING P. LTD., DAVOOD CHAMBERS,
WEST HILL, CHUNKAM, KOZHIKODE.

BY ADV. SRI.K.S.DILIP

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS

---

1. N.SURENDRAN, S/O. KARUNAKARAN NAIR,
AGED 38 YEARS, NARIKKOTT HOUSE, NADERI POST,
KOILANDI, KOZHIKODE.

2. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR.

BY

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 28/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V.RAMKUMAR, J.

.....

Crl.R.P. No. 2508 2007

.....

Dated: 28-6-2007

O R D E R

In this Revision filed under Section 397 read with Sec. 401 Cr.P.C. the petitioner who was the accused in S.T. No. 1405 of 2005 on the file of the Special Judl. First Class Magistrate (Marad Cases) Kozhikode, challenges the conviction entered and the sentence passed against him for an offence punishable under Sec. 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act').

2. I heard the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the Revision Petitioner re-iterated the contentions in support of the Revision. The courts below have concurrently held that the cheque in question was drawn by the appellant in favour of the complainant on the drawee bank, that the cheque was validly presented to the bank, that it was dishonoured for reasons which fall under Section 138 of the Act, that the complainant made a demand for payment by a notice in time in accordance with clause (b) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act and that the Revision Petitioner/accused failed to make the payment within 15 days of receipt of the statutory notice. Both the courts have considered and rejected the defence set up by the revision petitioner while entering the above finding. The said finding has been recorded

on an appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence. I do not find any error, illegality or impropriety in the finding so recorded concurrently by the courts below. The conviction was thus rightly entered against the petitioner.

4. What now survives for consideration is the question as to whether a proper sentence has been imposed on the Revision Petitioner. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am, however, inclined to modify the sentence imposed on the revision petitioner. Accordingly, if the revision petitioner pays to the first respondent complainant by way of compensation under Sec. 357 (3) Cr.P.C. a sum of Rs. **21,000/- (Rupees twenty one thousand only)** within **three months** from today, then he need to undergo only imprisonment till the rising of the court. If the revision petitioner commits default in making the payment as aforesaid, the sentence, imposed on him by the trial court shall revive.

5. Amount, if any, paid by the revision petitioner pursuant to the orders, passed by the lower appellate court shall be refunded to the petitioner.

This Revision is disposed of confirming the conviction but modifying the sentence as above.

V. RAMKUMAR, JUDGE.

ani/-

4. I am of the view that as against the sentence of..... imposed on the revision petitioner, following sentence will meet the ends of justice. Accordingly, for his conviction under Sec. 138 of the N.I. Act the Revision Petitioner is sentenced to.....

This Revision is disposed of confirming the conviction but modifying the sentence as above.

V. RAMKUMAR, JUDGE.

ani/-